



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **106<sup>th</sup>** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1999

No. 65

## *House of Representatives*

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, Chaplain, Lutheran Social Services, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Together with the Psalmist, we say, "Hear my prayer, O Lord, and give ear to my cry; . . . for I am a passing guest, a sojourner like all my fathers."

O God, on the day of national prayer, when people of many traditions and from a variety of national origins speak to You in many languages and address You with many different holy names, we pray.

Withhold not Your kindness from us for our failure to practice mercy to our neighbor while we request and expect Your mercy for ourselves. We pray,

Deliver us from a selfish pride that would allow even our faith in You to be understood as a sign of Your individual favoritism for us. We pray,

Guide us into ways of wisdom which would teach us the value You have for each person, the gift You have given to every human and the hope You have buried deep in the heart of all people. We pray,

Give us joy in our community, satisfaction in our labor, compassion for our neighbor, and peace in our relationships.

This day, O God, we join with many to give You our thanks and to promise again to love You with our whole heart and our neighbor as ourselves.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) come

forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MURTHA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 432. An act to designate the North/South Center as the Dante B. Fascell North/South Center.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 1 minutes at the end of the business of the day.

### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 1555, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I asked to address the House for the purpose of making an announcement. I rise to inform the House of the Committee on Rules' plans in regard to H.R. 1555, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

The Committee on Rules is planning to meet during the week of May 10 to grant a rule for the consideration of H.R. 1555, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The Committee on Rules may grant a rule for H.R. 1555 which would require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, if this type of rule is granted, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted to the Speaker's table. Amendments would still need to be consistent with House rules and would be given no special protection by being printed. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House. It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify as long as the amendments comply with the rules of the House.

### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1664, KOSOVO AND SOUTHWEST ASIA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 159 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 159

*Resolved*. That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1664) making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XIII or section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2815

on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment printed in the report may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for H.R. 1664, the Kosovo Operations Supplemental Appropriations Act. The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of Rule XIII requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report and requiring 3-day availability of printed hearings on a general appropriations bill and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 prohibiting consideration of legislation within the Committee on the Budget's jurisdiction unless reported by the Committee on the Budget.

The rules provide for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The bill waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI prohibiting unauthorized or legislative appropriations in a general appropriations bill.

The rule provides that before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules.

The rule makes in order amendments printed in the report accompanying this resolution which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole.

The rule waives all points of order against amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report.

The rule waives points of order during consideration of the bill against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of Rule XXI prohibiting non-emergency designated amendments to be offered on an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provide for 1 motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 159 is a fair rule. It is an open rule that permits any Member to offer any amendment to the bill as long as the amendment does not violate House rules.

The President's military campaign in Kosovo has put many of us in a tough spot. Like all Members, I support our troops, and I always support a strong national defense. I have strong reservations though about the President's decision to wage an ill-defined and possibly disastrous war in Yugoslavia because this war is draining our military resources, making it harder to meet threats in other areas of the world such as Iraq and North Korea. Our rear flank is exposed, which puts our military in harm's way.

We must replenish our military readiness and supplies. Our young men and women in the military need and deserve that from this Congress. This rule will allow amendments to express Members' concerns about giving the President the tools to continue a never-ending conflict in the Balkans.

Because this Kosovo spending bill is controversial, all Members need to support this rule so we can have an open discussion on the floor. Instead of closing down debate on this important issue, the Committee on Rules has pro-

vided for a fair and open amendment process. Members will have the opportunity to vote the Kosovo spending bill up or down, if they wish to do so, but in an hour we are not voting on Kosovo spending, we are voting on an open rule that allows the House to work its will.

That is why we are here, to express our ideas and concerns and the opinions of the people back home whom we represent.

I urge my colleagues to support this open rule which allows any Member to offer any amendment as long as it does not violate the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule which will allow consideration of H.R. 1664 which is the Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Bill for Fiscal Year 1999. The bill appropriates \$12.9 billion in emergency supplemental funds mostly for military personnel, equipment, pay, retirement benefits and construction. As my colleague has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

□ 1015

Technically, this is an open rule. However, under the Rules of the House dealing with emergency supplemental appropriations, virtually all amendments, except cutting amendments, can be ruled out of order unless the Committee on Rules grants a waiver. Despite the numerous requests from House members, the Committee on Rules granted waivers for only three amendments and one of those was by the ranking minority Member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule does not open the process. This rule does not give the House an opportunity to work its will. Therefore, I will oppose the rule and I urge House Members to defeat it.

The emergency supplemental appropriation bill before us today is a fat, bloated bill, with misplaced priorities. It puts buildings ahead of people. It funds long-term investments but denies money to immediate needs. This rule will not give House Members the chance to correct that.

I am particularly disturbed because the Committee on Rules denied my request to offer a bipartisan Hall-Roukema amendment to provide \$150 million in much needed food assistance to the Albanian Kosovar refugees and displaced persons in the Balkans.

Mr. Speaker, last weekend I went to Albania and Macedonia with a House delegation of 20 members, led by Majority Leader DICK ARMEY. We visited Stankovac 1, which is the largest refugee camp in Macedonia, which at that time housed 30,000 who were forced to flee from their homes in Kosovo.

This is only one of many refugee camps in the Balkans housing the victims of President Milosevic genocidal campaign of ethnic cleansing. Thousands more are arriving every day.

There is a critical need to feed these people. A report released last week by the U.N. World Food Programme calculated that 1.4 million refugees and misplaced people will need to be fed in the Balkans and that report estimated the cost of feeding them over the next 17 months to be almost \$300 million.

The situation is getting worse. I quote from the World Food Programme report: The situation for displaced and other people inside Kosovo is certain to worsen because the entire food distribution system has ground to a halt.

Without this money, many of the refugees face malnutrition or starvation. If the United States shifted money from other emergency feed accounts to handle this crisis, then we would have to cut our assistance to southern Sudan, North Korea and the Horn of Africa, Bangladesh and other crises.

The bill does include \$566 million for general humanitarian aid but this will be used mostly for medicine, shelter, sanitation. It is no substitute for food aid. Astonishingly the administration did not request any emergency funding through PL-480, which is the principal initial food assistance program. This is a sorry oversight. The Committee on Appropriations continued the glaring omission.

I note that PL-480 is one of the few forms of international food assistance that directly benefits hurting U.S. farmers.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that the purpose of NATO air strikes, which I support, are to protect the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, but there is no point to an air war to save the Kosovars if we leave them to starve and to be malnourished in refugee camps.

Mr. Speaker, this emergency funding bill includes \$156 million for military recruiting and advertising. It includes \$1.1 billion for construction projects in Europe and Asia. We can, we must, include money to feed the very people this bill is intended to help. Food for the Kosovars is also an emergency.

Adding funding for PL-480 in this bill is supported by the Coalition for Food Aid, which includes World Vision, CARE, the Catholic Relief Service, Save the Children and other groups.

The failure of the world's biggest food producer to provide food to refugees fleeing starvation and brutality inside Kosovo is astounding. The Hall-Roukema amendment would have added about 1 percent to the cost of the bill, about \$150 million.

The recent reports of food shortages in Kosovo suggests that Milosevic has added a new weapon in his campaign of ethnic cleansing: Hunger. Just as we are fighting the troops with air strikes, we should fight this new danger with food donations.

I want to thank my colleague the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs.

ROUKEMA) for her support of this amendment. Without money to take care of the food needs in the Balkans, the bill is seriously flawed, and by denying an opportunity to improve the bill this rule is fatally flawed. I urge a defeat of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the honorable chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to rise in support of this rule. The rule does provide for us an exciting day today in the House because there are a lot of different issues that are going to be addressed.

In many meetings, group sessions and one-on-one meetings that I have had leading up to today, I promised all of my colleagues that I would ask the Committee on Rules for an open rule so that Members could offer their amendments that would be germane and otherwise in order to the bill and let the majority work its will. That is exactly what I did. I did ask for an open rule. The Committee on Rules complied with that request.

The rule today is an open rule and Members will have an opportunity to offer their amendments, and I just ask that we support this rule and get on with the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this rule. I had not intended to. Yes, when we were in discussions with the Committee on Rules and the committee leadership, I had the feeling that with the promises that we had been given that we were going to see a new day in this House with more bipartisan cooperation in the way legislation is brought to the floor and that those promises were, in fact, going to be kept.

Then, after a series of conversations, apparently people behind the scenes decided that that rule was going to be shaped quite differently. Among the things that were done is that the committee put time limits—under what is supposedly an open rule, the committee still put time limits of 40 minutes—on the major amendment that we are going to be debating on this bill.

That amendment is very complicated; yet each side will only have 20 minutes to debate it. The amendment is complicated enough it will take 10 minutes to explain it, which will leave only 10 minutes to discuss the merits. That is not the way to debate questions of war or, for that matter, some of the other serious issues that are in this bill.

Secondly, another amendment is being offered by the majority which is paid for by hijacking items that were in our amendment to pay for the items that we have listed in our amendment. In my view, that is an effort to weaken political support for our amendment. I would simply point out that since the majority has two-thirds of the staffing available or more in this place, to put together their legislation, I do not think they have an operational need to, in effect, steal or highjack our amendments, but that is largely what has been done.

So it just seems to me that this rule is not what it was going to be yesterday and for that reason I am going to oppose it.

I also want to say something else. I think that what happened on this rule is symptomatic of what is happening on this entire bill. I did not vote for the Rambouillet endorsement when it was on the floor.

I do not believe in giving any administration a blank check, but we are now in a war and we have rampant misery which has been brought to the world, to the refugees and to a lot of others. We did not start that war; Mr. Milosevic did.

Now the question is: What will NATO and what will the United States do about it?

I believe we ought to do everything necessary to win. I do not believe the options for ground troops ought to be off the table and in that I very strongly agree with Senator MCCAIN. But to me, that issue right now is beside the point.

The issue is whether this House can come together and debate one of the most fundamental issues that will be before any legislative body, in a manner which is both bipartisan and constructive. I do not think this rule gets us off to a good start.

In my view, if we cannot play this issue straight we cannot play any issue straight, with American lives on the line and with the future credibility of NATO on the line.

What it seems to me is that we are being faced with a shifting understanding of what the rules are supposed to be for debating this legislation at the same time that we see spectacularly shifting positions on the part of the majority.

Last week, the House voted against supporting the operation that is now going on in Kosovo and yet this week we are now asked to more than double the request that the administration made to finance that operation. That makes no sense whatsoever.

I believe the reason that that has been done is that I believe last week's amendment was clearly intended to simply pin the label on the war of being Clinton's war, unfortunately politicizing the situation.

Now, this week I think there is an effort being made to in essence pour all kind of money into this bill so we can free up enough room for \$3 billion

worth of pork in the next defense bill. I think that is illegitimate. I do not think we ought to be treating a serious issue like this this way and I would urge a vote against the rule because it is not conducive to finding common ground on the most serious issue we face.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of what I think is a very responsible and open rule that gives Members a chance to consider a very wide variety point of view on what is a critical issue, as we all know. I cannot understand why we are having opposition to an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. operations in Kosovo have exposed the reality that the fabric of our national security has indeed worn very, very thin, at a time when it is still a dangerous world. Over the last several years, the Clinton-Gore administration has demanded more from the military but it has actually provided less resources for the military.

From Somalia to Haiti, Bosnia, Iraq, all those places, our troops are being deployed overseas, more often, for longer periods of time, even as our defense budget has been cut or has been held even.

Well, today the bill has come due. It is simply time to pay up. The supplemental appropriation under consideration under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) will address the immediate needs arising from the U.S. operation in the Balkans, but it will also shore up other critical readiness areas that have been sadly depleted.

Mr. Speaker, last week's debate on the War Powers Act showed that Congress was of many minds on the policy issue, but this debate today is not about policy. I repeat, this is not a policy debate today. It is about money. It is about resources to take care of our troops, and that is something that Congress must pursue with a single-minded intensity.

Who among us would deny our troops in harm's way the best training, the best equipment, the best odds to survive and to win with the least casualties?

I know that some of my colleagues would like to deal with the policy issue by refusing to fund military operations in Kosovo.

□ 1030

They are absolutely right, that policy missteps by the Clinton-Gore administration can have grave consequences, as we have seen vividly and tragically in Somalia when the body of

a U.S. soldier was dragged through the streets of Mogadishu.

But failing to fund our troops' needs would invite the same kind of disaster by leaving our men and women on the front lines without the training and resources they need to protect themselves.

I encourage my colleagues to support this rule and vote for the supplemental appropriations bill. Taking care of our troops and our national security are among the most fundamental duties this body has.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has again demonstrated its willingness to try to have things both ways. In some circles, it might be said that railing against a military action and then doubling the money to fight it should be called hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to explain how a political party can, on one hand, demonstrate its visceral hostility towards the President, and then, on the other hand, turn around and double his request for money for what they call Clinton's war. All I can do is shake my head in disbelief.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time for political gamesmanship. Today, right now, our military stands in harm's way. Today is the time for Congress to stand up and support them, and not play games with their lives in order to advance a political agenda.

Democrats have, in spite of the divergence of views within our Caucus, gone to great lengths to keep politics out of the debate about Kosovo. How I wish I could say the same thing about the other party.

Mr. Speaker, in all likelihood I will vote for the supplemental made in order by this rule. The rule itself is irresponsible and unfair. It allocates some of the money voted in the original supplemental for agricultural assistance, but it denies a separate vote on the disaster assistance for Central America, and it denies a vote to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) on supplemental food assistance for the refugees in Albania.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are fond of chanting their mantra that the President has underfunded the Armed Forces, but I would like to offer an alternative, and more accurate, perspective. Last year the President asked for \$2.9 billion more for defense spending than either the Senate or the House Republican budget resolutions provided. Two years ago the President asked for \$12.3 billion more. This year the President asked for \$104 billion more in budget authority and \$198 billion more in outlays for the next decade than did the Republican budget.

I may not have agreed with all the President's priorities, Mr. Speaker, but the fact is that his budget requests have been significantly higher than

what the Republican Congress has agreed to in their budget resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Caucus is divided about the amount of extra military spending in this supplemental, but I would be hard-pressed to find a member of our caucus who does not think that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) was treated unfairly last night by the Republican leadership and the Republican members of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, no one in the House, no one, speaks with more moral authority about the issue of hunger than does my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL). Each and every Member of this House knows full well that the actions of Milosevic in Kosovo have created a humanitarian catastrophe that has sent Kosovar Albanians streaming out of their homeland seeking safety in their neighboring countries of Albania and Montenegro. Mr. Speaker, sadly, no one in the administration anticipated this level of disaster.

The Committee on Rules last night had, in the words of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the opportunity to do the right thing, but the Republican majority took a pass. Does the hostility of the Republican Party toward the President reach so deep that hungry children are going to be made to suffer? Pardon the pun, but that should be food for thought for all of us.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, passage of this defense spending supplemental is so important to the Republican majority that this rule also makes in order an amendment designed to appease the most conservative wing of their party. That amendment, sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), would in essence cut domestic non-defense discretionary spending across the board by 5 percent.

So not only will the Republican majority not allow an additional \$150 million in spending for food assistance for Kosovar Albanian refugees, the Republicans are willing to cut other domestic programs to fund supplemental military spending.

All I can do, Mr. Speaker, is shake my head in disbelief.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule for the Kosovo emergency appropriations bill. It is an open rule. It is a fair rule. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The Committee on Rules was given a tough task this week, and I commend them for their hard work. In two important ways the rule provides an opportunity to add a critical component to the underlying bill: specifically, how to pay for it.

First, it protects a provision that I authored to force the President to pursue NATO reimbursements for our costs in Operation Allied Force and report back to Congress on its progress by September 30 of this year.

Second, the rule gives priority to an amendment by myself and two colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from South Carolina. Our amendment uses a combination of NATO reimbursements and across-the-board reductions to ensure that the new, additional emergency spending in this bill will be fully offset.

We give the President to the end of this fiscal year to secure NATO reimbursements, and the remaining amount of offsets, if necessary, would come from small reductions in non-defense discretionary spending in the next fiscal year.

It is important to note that the amendment uses a sequester mechanism already in budget law and would exempt several programs from any reductions.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Committee on Rules, and I urge my colleagues to pass this rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. This bill, along with last week's votes on Kosovo, reveal a fundamental flaw in the majority party's vision of national security.

First, the majority of House Republicans voted against our military's effort to stop genocide in Kosovo. Now that same majority uses funding for the operation as an excuse for \$6 billion in non-Kosovo military spending. The majority whip calls us chicken hawks.

The other side complains that the administration's defense policy is "doing more with less." But in rejecting Kosovo while giving the Pentagon \$6 billion more, these critics embrace a doctrine of doing nothing with everything. In today's world, we cannot afford to do nothing. With today's budget, we cannot afford to buy everything.

Republicans complain that our military's efforts to bring peace to the Balkans undermines readiness. Ready for what, if not Kosovo? Ready for the Soviet Union to spring to life, or Nazi Germany? Readiness is not an end in itself, it is a means to an end, our military's ability to carry out its mission, a means to ensuring our own security and prosperity.

Ethnic conflict and regional instability, as in Kosovo, threaten our security and prosperity. It makes no sense to build up fortress America and sit inside idle while the world outside falls apart. Congress' decisions on the military must reflect the world as it is and will be, rather than a world of the past.

I urge my colleagues to support this needed funding for our troops over Kosovo, and to resist playing games with it. We are better than that.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. The rule is far from perfect, but it allows adequate debate, and it will certainly allow us who think that it is unwise to increase the spending to vote against the spending. It certainly allows an opportunity for those who think that we should double the spending to explain why we should spend so much money on a war that we have not declared.

Mr. Speaker, we have to realize that this war has been pursued for over a month. We have not appropriated the funds, so whether or not we act today, the war will continue, unfortunately. The war has not been declared, but if we go ahead and fund it, we become partners in this war. I do not think that is a wise policy. We should not provide the funding.

Mr. Speaker, there is a fallacy, that floats around this House that says that if we increase the funding for the military, we will have greater defense. That reminds me of the accusation from the right that always challenges the left that says, if there is a social problem, all you want ever to do is throw more money at it. The worse the problem gets, the more money they want to spend on the social problem.

It seems like the worse our defense gets and the more we get into quagmires around the world and the more we accept the policy of policing the world, all we seem to do is come back and say, well, if we just put more money in it, everything is going to be okay.

But if we are in a quagmire, if we are following a policy that is unwise, the money might just make conditions much worse. I think this is why we must defeat the spending on this program, because the problems with what is happening in Bosnia and Kosovo and Iraq will be compounded as long as the administration has the money to fund the war.

Yes, I am for a strong national defense, but if the policy is wrong, it will undermine all the spending. The money will actually be wasted. Funding encourages a policy that is in error. Funding is an endorsement of the war. We must realize that it is equivalent to it. We have not declared this war. If we fund it, we essentially become partners in this ill-advised war.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this rule, despite my disappointment with several of my amendments not receiving waivers.

There will be lots of seemingly contradictory statements made during today's debate about this bill. Some will say this bill is about rebuilding our military, which it is. Some will say it is about raising the pay of our courageous men and women in service, which it is. Some will say it gives the admin-

istration the dollars which not only will escalate this war, but possibly expand it to a ground war, which it does.

This modified open rule not only restricts amendments that would have moved needed national defense funds to other appropriations categories, but also restricts a number, under House rules, of amendments that could have prohibited the buildup of the war, such as an amendment by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DAN BURTON).

Overwhelmingly, the House had passed an amendment that would have restricted a ground war, but it is not allowed under this bill, where it would have had the force of law. Several amendments of mine that would have reached back were also prohibited.

So while there are a number of waivers, there are not any waivers for those of us who were trying to affect some of the ability of previous funds to be moved around.

However, by allowing a modified open rule, it still gives many of us the flexibility to offer amendments that are within the House rules that will greatly restrict this Administration's ability to escalate and expand this war, and possibly even force the needed peace settlement that is pending. Our House vote last week clearly pushed the administration towards that, along with the work of Reverend Jesse Jackson.

This rule will most likely, and it should, pass. That is quite a difference from the last few sessions of Congress. Quite frankly, in the last few sessions when we had a controversial vote like this, many of us were jammed. That resulted in us coming to the floor and taking down a rule. I learned there were more woodsheds out in this floor than I believed were possible. We were hauled in. We were told our party was collapsing. We were told the whole Congress was going to fold. We were going to lose control of Congress.

But in fact, a lot of this controversy inside our party has been alleviated by our new Speaker, who has at least given us the flexibility to offer different amendments. We as a party need to pull together and pass this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to reluctantly support this rule because it does allow some amendments that will hopefully force the President to come before this body and the Senate before he would send ground troops into Kosovo. I am not sure it will do it, but I think at least it expresses the will of the Congress that we would like for him to come before this House and the Senate before sending our troops into harm's way.

When President George Bush decided to go into the Persian Gulf, there was great planning involved. We created an

army of 550,000 troops, and before we went in there was a very sound battle plan. When we went into Kosovo, the Joint Chiefs of Staff indicated to the President that they thought it was a mistake to start bombing without more planning.

Nevertheless, the President chose to do it because he thought, in his own wisdom, that he could end this thing in a short period of time. The Nazis could not do it, and we have not done it in the last 30 days. Now they are talking about sending in ground troops.

Hopefully, the discussions that are going on in Germany today will preclude that possibility by getting other U.N. forces in there to deal with this problem. But the fact of the matter is, proper planning has not taken place.

□ 1045

And as a result, if we send ground troops in there, we are going to see a lot of young men and women come home in body bags or being maimed.

What Nazi Germany could not do in years we are talking about doing in months, and we are talking about sending 200,000 or 300,000 ground troops in there. I tell my colleagues, in my opinion, the poor planning, the ineffective leadership out of the White House, the poor foreign policy will lead to a disaster if we do not take proper precautions.

That is why this House, the people's House, and the other body needs to be involved in the decision-making process. The American people need to have all the facts before them through their elected representatives. The case needs to be made before we ever send one young man or one young lady into harm's way into Kosovo.

That is why I think it is extremely important that that point be made today, that it has to be made clear to the White House, do not do this without consulting with this body and the other body. Because if we get into a ground war without proper planning, without all the people working together, with the entire Nation behind it, it is a recipe for disaster. We saw that happen in Vietnam when the country came apart.

We need proper planning. We need the leadership of the Congress to be involved in the decision-making process as well as every Member here voting on it. So I would just urge the White House that after we appropriate this money today, and I am sure it is going to happen and the rule will pass, I urge the White House to consult with this body before ever sending one young man or one young lady into harm's way in Kosovo.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this

time; and I also commend Mr. HALL for his tremendous leadership.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) said earlier, no one has greater standing in this body than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) when it comes to meeting the needs of the hungry throughout the world. We are blessed to serve with him, and it is a privilege to call him colleague.

Mr. Speaker, we are all very blessed to have the privilege to serve in this body. We speak for the American people. They give us this privilege, and we should deal with it responsibly. We owe them that, to use our best thinking and our arts of compromise to come to agreement on issues for America's future. At no time is it more important that we put our partisanship aside, as when we put our children in harm's way, our young people in harm's way, as they are now in the Balkans.

That is why it was so disappointing to see the rule that came to the floor this morning. Last night I went home fully prepared to come in to vote for the rule. We were told that we had bipartisan cooperation and that it would be an open rule. Indeed, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations heralded it just that way in his remarks just a few moments ago when he said this is an open rule which will allow each Member to bring his or her amendment to the floor.

But what form do those amendments take? Would others consider it their amendment if, as in the case of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the Republican majority altered the amendment? Certainly they knew the appeal of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. It is responsible, it addresses our military needs, it recognizes the increased cost of the huge number of refugees who unexpectedly descended upon Macedonia and Albania, and it has the urgency of Hurricane Mitch contained in it. It also addresses the needs of America's farmers.

They knew that it was responsible. They knew it would appeal to their Republican Members. That is why it was so disappointing to see the illusion of an open rule with a rule that changed the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, co-opting the provision on agricultural assistance and giving a piece of that amendment to one of their colleagues, hoping to deflect support from the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin by having a separate agricultural vote.

And what they also lost is the success of the Obey amendment, which contains, again, \$175 million in humanitarian assistance. Others have said that there is disagreement about the policy and the war and the air strikes and the rest. I myself support President Clinton's action and commend him for his courageous leadership. But one thing we all agree on is that the American people want us to provide humanitarian assistance. They do not want to see the most vulnerable, the children and the elderly, starving and

freezing and going without the absolute basic necessities. But unless we have the additional humanitarian assistance, that will be the case.

In addition, in the so-called open rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), as was mentioned, was denied the opportunity to put in \$150 million in additional food assistance for the refugees. How can this be called an open rule if the gentleman from Ohio, who is on the committee, has standing on the issue, is present at the table to make his case, is denied the opportunity to present an amendment which will give people food to eat? We are talking about the basics.

I was pleased to join our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), on a visit to the Balkans. We visited the refugee camps. We can speak firsthand as to the needs there and to how those needs have grown since the administration made its request to Congress.

I support the President's request, I support the President's support of the NATO action, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

For some reason, between yesterday, when there was a spirit of cooperation for an open rule that we could all support. That rule would give the American people what they should expect of us, which is a reasoned and informed debate on the actions in the Balkans and how much we should be paying for it. Instead we are faced with the choice of voting for twice as much money as the President asked for in his bill on a policy that the Republican majority rejected last week. I guess they are saying, "We do not agree with you, but we want you to spend twice as much money to pay for it."

In sadness, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and I would just point out that the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin is printed in the rule exactly as it was offered.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule. The emergency defense appropriations bill is vitally important to our national security, whether we agree with NATO's involvement in Kosovo or not.

I have not been shy in stating my own opposition to the manner in which the President has handled this situation, but this bill is about supporting our troops and making sure they have the tools and the training that they need to return home safely.

This bill is about making sure that our interests are secure on a global basis, and right now I am disheartened to say they are not. In fact, the Pentagon has told us that there will be a readiness crisis if they do not get this funding by Memorial Day. If we ever had a military emergency, it is right now, and that emergency reaches much farther than the endless air raids going on in the Balkans.

Since we started talking about this bill a few weeks ago, I have heard story

after story from my colleagues about the terrible situation our military is facing, about soldiers who have never trained with live rounds and pilots who are not getting flight time because there are no spare parts to repair their planes. This kind of readiness crisis means that our national security is presently at serious risk.

Now, this rule gives us an opportunity to mitigate that risk. We have an obligation to support our troops and refurbish the military that is currently being hollowed out to fund this war effort, and we have the responsibility to do this as expeditiously as possible, which is exactly what this rule does.

Let me say to my friends that I understand they may not agree with the emergency nature of this bill. My colleagues may object to the war in Kosovo on its face, as I do, or to using this kind of vehicle to refurbish our stripped-down Armed Forces. But the process must not be undermined.

I heard a lot last week about the votes we had on the floor over Kosovo. Some folks said that we sent the wrong message to Milosevic. Well, make no mistake about it, while I object to the President's handling of this situation, I know our troops need our support now more than ever. The Congress cannot abandon our troops just because the President deploys them unwisely. We must support our troops even as we disagree with the President. This rule and this bill will convey exactly that message to Serbia and to the Americans stationed there.

Mr. Speaker, our troops are in harm's way. Our national security is at risk. We have an obligation to give our sons and daughters everything they need to protect themselves. We have an obligation not to abandon our troops in the field. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time; and I rise in support of the rule today.

It is very, very important that the farm credit provisions in the amendment that we will be putting forward was made a part of the discussion today, and the amendment will be offered.

As everyone knows, agriculture is in a very difficult situation today. The USDA has not been able to get out the checks that are needed as far as the disaster that we passed last year, the \$2.3 billion.

We have a credit crisis in agriculture today, and we have to use every possible means to make sure that we get credit to our farmers this spring. They are in the field today. And we appreciate very much the Committee on Rules allowing us to have this amendment be part of the debate today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I just heard the distinguished majority whip indicate that we cannot abandon our troops in the field. I do not know of a single person in the House who has any intention of doing that. I do think that the interpretation of the vote that occurred last week might, in some people's minds, be interpreted that way, but I certainly do not know of anyone who intentionally intends to do that on either side of the aisle.

I do want to take just a moment to discuss this myth that somehow it is the Clinton administration which has created a military readiness problem. I would point out that for 4½ years the majority party has controlled this Congress. During that time it has added \$27 billion to the President's military requests.

□ 1100

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that less than \$4 billion of that \$27 billion went into readiness items such as operation and maintenance. The rest of the items went into what are largely considered military pork projects: the consolation prize destroyer that was provided in the district of the majority leader in the other body after his contractor was not selected by the Defense Department, the decision of the Congress to fund 10 additional C-130s that the Pentagon did not ask for rather than putting that funding into readiness.

Senator McCAIN himself has pointed out that there were more than \$4½ billion worth of pork items in the military budget last year. They were in charge. If they thought there was a readiness problem, why did they not put the money there rather than where they put it?

I saw a comment in the paper which said that the President was responsible for the fact that there were not enough JDAMs. The fact is they cut those missiles by 17 percent last year in the defense budget they brought to the floor.

So let us keep the record straight.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. It is an open rule, and I believe it is the right thing for us to do. I congratulate my friend from Charlotte, North Carolina, for the very able job that she has done under somewhat difficult circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, military policy by committee does not work. The Constitution gives the President the clear authority to lead in situations like today in the Balkans. It is now his responsibility to ensure that our national interests are protected. Many Americans, including Members of this body, have serious doubts about the President's

overall policy in the Balkans, whether vital national interests were on the line at all in Kosovo. Others are deeply concerned with the military strategy to date, namely, whether the current air campaign can prevail.

Mr. Speaker, the price of failure in Kosovo is simply too great at this point. American prestige and power, two of the most positive forces for good in the world today, cannot be abandoned on the field of battle. Developing and implementing a strategy that wins is the President's first responsibility to the American people.

Congress must ensure that the resources are available to carry out that strategy, as well as to ensure that our national security infrastructure around the globe is able to protect our national interests. This bill will, in fact, make sure that that is the case.

Now, as has been said, Mr. Speaker, this is, in fact, an open rule. I do not understand how any Member of this body could conceivably vote against an open rule. What we have done is we have provided the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the opportunity to offer his amendment. It has not been changed. It is the amendment that he submitted to us, and we have made that in order.

We also are addressing a concern that was raised about offsets, and so we have made in order the amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

We also are very concerned about immediately addressing the needs of our agriculture interests across this country, and so we have made in order the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) which will effectively deal with that.

Now, there are many people who also want us to deal with questions of policy on the Balkans. This open amendment process ensures that that will, in fact, happen. Under the open amendment process, we will be able to consider the Rohrabacher amendment, the Souder amendment. Other questions will come up as to exactly what our role should be and what level of funding should be there for it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong vote in support of this rule. It has been carefully crafted. It should enjoy bipartisan support.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Ohio has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in opposition to what I see as the irresponsibility of the Republican leadership in addressing domestic and international emergencies.

We want to send a strong message of support for our troops in Kosovo today, and I hope that we will. But the Republican leadership has a consistently poor

record of leadership when it comes to providing emergency assistance to those in need.

During the last 2 years, Republicans have politicized emergency appropriations bills and delayed, sometimes for months, getting needed assistance to our farmers in California and North Dakota who have experienced disasters. We all remember that in 1997, when the Republican leadership sent the House home for the Memorial Day recess while North Dakotans flooded out of their homes waited for relief.

Today, emergency assistance for our farmers and for critical Central America has waited for months while Republicans use the Kosovo supplemental appropriations bill as a vehicle for their political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, these are the faces and this is the tragedy of what is happening in Central America. But 6 months has passed since Hurricane Mitch killed more than 9,000 people in Central America in the worst disaster in 200 years. Thousands more are missing, and tens of thousands have been left homeless. \$5.3 billion in damage to this region has wiped away 50 years of progress and returned the region to the level of development it had in the beginning of the century. Yet the Republicans continue to turn their backs on this tragedy in our own hemisphere.

The emergency supplemental is critical to the reconstruction of this region. If emergency aid is not received soon, it will lead to the political instability of the region and cause mass migration towards the United States. Responsible leadership means support for our troops, and it means helping our farmers in need. But responsible leadership also means that we must help those in the backyard of our own hemisphere.

I support the Obey amendment as a common-sense approach to balancing the many emergency needs that require our attention. The Republican leadership must stop playing political games while American farmers and our troops and our neighbors in Central America continue to suffer.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will just make a few comments in closing.

I believe that this bill is a fat one, and I think it is bloated, and it has a lot of misplaced priorities. It technically is an open rule. But because it comes under the emergency rules, it is very restrictive because it gives tremendous power and ability to the Committee on Appropriations to pretty much decide the fate for the whole Nation here.

It is hard to get at this bill. The bill started at \$6 billion, and kind of overnight it went to \$12 billion. And a lot of these items, while important, are really not, in my opinion, high priority.

We have got an item in here for \$156 million for advertising. Gee, that is

really a high priority and exciting, that we are going to give \$156 million to some companies on Madison Avenue to advertise, when in fact we do not have any food aid in this bill.

And I find the fact that we cannot amend it to be not only restrictive but very frustrating. Not only did our administration miss it, but the Committee on Appropriations missed it. And because of that and other restrictive rules, we must oppose it.

One of the things that I am reminded of and I keep in the back of my mind is, when the delegation went to Macedonia and Albania this past weekend, one of the things that we kept hearing from our own pilots was the fact that as they flew over Kosovo it was like one great big bonfire, thousands upon thousands of house fires were lit up as they would fly over. It went for miles. The whole country was lit up.

In questioning the refugees in the camps that we were at, there was not one family that I talked to that did not have their house burned down, that were not robbed. And one man has caused this. We are not there because we like being there. We are not there because we are trying to feed people. We are there because one person caused a million people to be affected in such a way that I find it unbelievable.

So when we get a chance to really fund our priorities, one of the highest priorities of being able to feed people, we do not even have that kind of food item in here.

So, for these reasons and others, the fact that it is so restrictive, we must oppose this rule and, hopefully, defeat it and come back with a much better rule and much better bill that really funds what the priority should be according to this crisis that we are in over there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 8 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House.

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina very much for yielding me time.

Ladies and gentlemen of Congress, I rise in support of this rule and the supplemental. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Let me just say, I have heard some rhetoric since I have been here the last 10 or 15 minutes that there is not enough food aid or refugee assistance in here. There is \$600 million in here, as requested by the President, for food and refugee assistance, \$600 million. It is in the line. It is there. And to say it is not is just purely false. It is there. It was asked by the President. We put that money in.

But this vote today is probably one of the most important votes we can

take as Members of Congress. The issue is simple: Do you support our men and women in uniform as they defend America's interests and will you help us restore our Nation's defense so that our soldiers can do their jobs?

Last week, the House spoke on the President's policies concerning the engagement in Kosovo; and, Clearly, the House had some misgivings about those policies. But today, let there be no mistake, the United States Congress stands with its soldiers, sailors, and airmen as they defend America.

Since the conclusion of the Cold War, the Federal Government has steadily drawn down its defenses. In fact, this administration's budgets have severely reduced those budgets of our military over the last few years, and for good reason. The President did so under the assumption that the world was a safer place in the absence of a Soviet threat.

But, with Saddam Hussein, the instability in North Korea and with the current situation in Kosovo, we have learned a valuable lesson: The world is not a safer place. And, in fact, the threats from terrorist nations have increased, and we must be prepared to defend America's interests.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the persons in the gallery to refrain from conversations. The speaker on the floor deserves to be heard. Visitors are the guests of the House, and the Chair requires your compliance.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, the money we spend today will start the process of giving our soldiers and sailors and airmen the resources they need to do their jobs. It will make certain that they have the training they need to keep them safe. It will give them the livable housing and reasonable wages. It will give them spare parts they need to keep their planes in the air. And it will give them the munitions to allow them to carry out their missions.

To my colleagues who disagree with the President's policy, let me say simply, you had your vote last week. To my colleagues who want to pick this supplemental apart, let me say that this, too, is important for our servicemen and servicewomen to not be subject to partisan politics.

Now is the time to rise above the partisanship and vote for the good of the country as a whole. To my colleagues who feel we should offset this emergency spending, let me say that this bill represents our best efforts to deal with the national emergency. And to my colleagues who worry about the impact of this vote on the Social Security Trust Fund, let me say, we will replenish that money to the Social Security Trust Fund. We cannot replenish the lives of our soldiers that may be lost if we fail to provide adequate resources to them in this time of need.

Let me state again: Every penny of Social Security receipts will be credited to the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect the Congress to act responsibly

when it comes to providing for our Nation's security. Let us not fail them. Vote for this rule, vote for this defense supplemental, and vote for our soldiers and sailors and airmen as they defend America.

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we have committed our armed forces to the conflict in Kosovo and now we must pay for it. This unanticipated expense is a classic example of what constitutes emergency spending. I have voted to support our troops and the NATO operation in Yugoslavia. We need to provide emergency funding for our troops in the field.

But the emergency appropriations bill that we will be asked to support, today, spends more than twice the 6 billion dollars requested by our military commanders for Kosovo. It will add billions of dollars in spending for non-emergency items that should be considered during our normal budget process.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I clearly understand that the military has pressing needs, including improved pay and benefits for the troops, military infrastructure, equipment and spare parts. I support a pay raise for the military, pay scale reform, and retirement benefits reform. Our troops have earned a raise and it is the right thing to do.

But I don't believe that an emergency supplemental should be loaded up with spending that is more appropriately considered during the regular budget process. I don't think that today's bill shows a commitment to honest budgeting and spending controls.

□ 1115

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 171, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—253

Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Camp
Ackerman	Bishop	Campbell
Aderholt	Bliley	Canady
Archer	Blunt	Cannon
Armey	Boehlert	Castle
Bachus	Boehner	Chabot
Baker	Bonilla	Chambliss
Baldacci	Bono	Clement
Ballenger	Borski	Coble
Barr	Brady (PA)	Coburn
Barrett (NE)	Brady (TX)	Collins
Bartlett	Brown (FL)	Combest
Barton	Bryant	Condit
Bass	Burr	Cook
Bateman	Burton	Cooksey
Bereuter	Buyer	Cramer
Biggert	Callahan	Crane
Bilbray	Calvert	Cubin

Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Reynolds	Lucas (KY)	Ortiz
Davis (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Riley	Luther	Snyder
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Roemer	Maloney (NY)	Spratt
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Rogan	Markey	Stabenow
DeMint	Kanjorski	Rogers	Martinez	Pallone
Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Rohrabacher	Matsui	Stark
Dickey	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen	McCarthy (MO)	Payne
Dicks	King (NY)	Roukema	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Doolittle	Kingston	Royce	McDermott	Pelosi
Doyle	Klink	Ryan (WI)	McGovern	Peterson (MN)
Dreier	Knollenberg	Ryun (KS)	McIntyre	Tanner
Duncan	Kolbe	Salmon	McKinney	Tauscher
Dunn	LaHood	Sanford	Meeker	Thompson (CA)
Ehlers	Largent	Saxton	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Ehrlich	Latham	Scarborough	Menendez	Rahall
Emerson	LaTourette	Schaffer	Millender	Thurman
English	Lazio	Sensenbrenner	McDonald	Rothman
Everett	Leach	Sessions	Miller, George	Royal-Allard
Ewing	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg	Minge	Rush
Fletcher	Lewis (KY)	Shaw	Sabo	Vento
Foley	Linder	Shays	Mink	Visclosky
Forbes	LoBiondo	Sherwood	Moakley	Sanchez
Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Shimkus	Moore	Waters
Fowler	Maloney (CT)	Shows	Nadler	Sanders
Franks (NJ)	Manzullo	Shuster	Napolitano	Waxman
Frelinghuysen	Mascara	Simpson	Neal	Sandlin
Gallegly	McCollum	Sisisky	Obey	Weiner
Ganske	McCrary	Skeen	Olver	Wexler
Gekas	McHugh	Skelton	Smith (WA)	Weygand
Gibbons	McInnis	Smith (MI)	Scott	Wise
Gilcrest	McIntosh	Smith (NJ)	Serrano	Woolsey
Gillmor	McKeon	Smith (TX)	Cox	Wu
Gilman	Meek (FL)	Souder	Tiahrt	
Goode	Metcalf	Spence		
Goodlatte	Mica	Stearns		
Goodling	Miller (FL)	Stenholm		
Goss	Miller, Gary	Stump		
Graham	Mollohan	Sununu		
Granger	Moran (KS)	Sweeney		
Green (TX)	Moran (VA)	Talent		
Green (WI)	Morella	Tancredo		
Greenwood	Murtha	Tauzin		
Hall (TX)	Myrick	Taylor (MS)		
Hansen	Nethercutt	Taylor (NC)		
Hastert	Ney	Terry		
Hastings (WA)	Northup	Thomas		
Hayes	Norwood	Thornberry		
Hayworth	Nussle	Thune		
Heffley	Ose	Toomey		
Herger	Oxley	Traficant		
Hill (MT)	Packard	Upton		
Hilleary	Pascarella	Walden		
Hobson	Paul	Walsh		
Hoefel	Pease	Wamp		
Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Watkins		
Holden	Petri	Watt (NC)		
Hooley	Pickering	Watts (OK)		
Horn	Pickett	Weldon (FL)		
Hostettler	Pitts	Weldon (PA)		
Houghton	Pombo	Weller		
Hulshof	Porter	Whitfield		
Hunter	Portman	Wicker		
Hutchinson	Pryce (OH)	Wolf		
Hyde	Quinn	Young (AK)		
Isakson	Radanovich	Young (FL)		
Istook	Ramstad			
Jenkins	Regula			

NAYS—171

Allen	Davis (FL)	Hill (IN)
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Hilliard
Baird	DeFazio	Hinchey
Baldwin	DeGette	Hinojosa
Barcia	Delahunt	Holt
Barrett (WI)	DeLauro	Hoyer
Becerra	Deutsch	Inslee
Bentsen	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	Dixon	Jackson-Lee
Berry	Doggett	(TX)
Blagojevich	Dooley	Jefferson
Blumenauer	Edwards	John
Bonior	Engel	Jones (OH)
Boswell	Eshoo	Kaptur
Boucher	Etheridge	Kennedy
Boyd	Fattah	Kind (WI)
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kilpatrick
Capps	Fattah	Kleczka
Capuano	Filner	Kucinich
Clement	Ford	LaFalce
Carbin	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Carson	Frost	Lantos
Clay	Gejdenson	Larson
Clayton	Gephhardt	Lee
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Levin
Conyers	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Costello	Gutierrez	Lipinski
Coyne	Gordon	Lowey
Cramer	Gutknecht	Lofgren
Crane	Hall (OH)	
Cummings	Hastings (FL)	
Danner	Hastings (FL)	

Lucas (KY)	Ortiz	Snyder
Riley	Luther	Spratt
Roemer	Maloney (NY)	Stabenow
Rogan	Markey	Pallone
Rohrabacher	Martinez	Pastor
Ros-Lehtinen	Matsui	Payne
Roukema	McCarthy (MO)	Strickland
Royce	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Ryan (WI)	McDermott	Pelosi
Ryun (KS)	McGovern	Peterson (MN)
Salmon	McIntyre	Tanner
Sanford	McKinney	Tauscher
Saxton	McCormick	Thompson (CA)
Scarborough	McCormick	Thompson (MS)
Shaw	McDermott	Rahall
Shays	McGovern	Thurman
Sherwood	McIntyre	Tierney
Shimkus	McKinney	Towns
Shows	Miller, George	Udall (CO)
Shuster	Miller, George	Udall (NM)
Simpson	Miller, George	Rothman
Sisisky	Miller, George	Royal-Allard
Skeen	Miller, George	Rush
Skelton	Miller, George	Vento
Smith (MI)	Minge	Wise
Smith (NJ)	Mink	Waters
Smith (TX)	Moakley	Waxman
Souder	Moore	Sanders
Spence	Nadler	Sandlin
Stearns	Napolitano	Weiner
Stenholm	Neal	Sawyer
Stump	Neal	Wexler
Sununu	Obey	Schakowsky
Sweeney	Olver	Weygand
Talent	Smith (WA)	Wise
Tancredo	Tiahrt	Woolsey
Tauzin	Tiahrt	Wu

NOT VOTING—10

Berman	Kuykendall	Wilson
Brown (CA)	McNulty	Wynn
Chenoweth	Slaughter	
Cox	Tiahrt	

□ 1134

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1664, making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### KOSOVO AND SOUTHWEST ASIA EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 159 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1664.

□ 1138

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the